

VI

AN EXAMINATION
OF THE
VIEWS HELD AND ADVOCATED
BY THE
ANA-BAPTISTS.

"A TRUE BAPTIST."

TORONTO:
JAMES BAIN & SON.
1875.

JAMES BAIN & SON,

Publishers, Booksellers & Stationers.

MAGAZINES AND PERIODICALS

REGULARLY SUPPLIED.

PRINTING AND BOOKBINDING

ON THE SHORTEST NOTICE.

BLANK BOOKS,

Manufactured to Order.

CONSTANTLY ON HAND A FULL SUPPLY OF

Commercial and Fancy Stationery.

ARTISTS' MATERIAL.

NEW PUBLICATIONS,

etc., etc., etc.

40 KING STREET EAST, TORONTO.

AN EXAMINATION
OF THE
VIEWS HELD AND ADVOCATED
BY THE
ANA-BAPTISTS.

BY
"A TRUE BAPTIST."

TORONTO:
JAMES BAIN & SON.
1875.

J49535



PREFACE.

LAST winter and spring the minds of several thoughtful and anxious persons having been disturbed by the confident assertions of some Baptist, or, rather Ana-Baptist preachers, and diverted from the all-important subject of the Gospel-way of salvation, the author felt it his duty to attempt to calm the agitation. For this purpose he hurriedly composed the following examination of the question, and delivered the substance of it in public. The effort so far accomplished the object intended, that several who heard the address requested its publication.

The author regrets that the limited time at his command does not enable him to improve upon the original draft, and change its form. He may state that he is practically unacquainted with law proceedings, and was, therefore, unable to adhere closely to legal forms of speech, though without premeditation he examined the question as if before a judicial tribunal.

OCTOBER, 1875.

BAPTISM.

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."—
Matt. xxviii. 19.

BEFORE his ascension to heaven Christ commissioned the Apostles to go forth and proclaim throughout the world that he came to teach sinners the saving knowledge of God, and to inform them that he was willing to receive into his school all disposed to be instructed. These messengers were directed to enrol as disciples all who professed their desire to be taught by Christ. This enrolment was to be done by "baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

All Christian churches agree that this ordinance is to be administered by the application of water, in the name of the three persons of the Trinity "by a minister of the Gospel, lawfully called thereunto," (*Confession of Faith.*) A difference of opinion, however, exists as to the mode of applying the water, and with regard to those who should be admitted to the ordinance. All denominations, except Baptists, believe that the sprinkling or pouring of the water upon the candidates is Scriptural, and therefore sufficient; and that those who profess their faith in Christ, together with their infant children, should be baptized. The Baptists, on the other hand, maintain that baptism is not Scriptural and valid, unless the candidates are completely immersed in water, and they also hold that none but adult believers should be admitted to the rite.

When we examine the instructions given by Christ to his disciples, we do not find any mode expressly specified, unless it is signified by the word "baptizing" used in the commission. If that word does not express the mode, it is either indifferent, or, it is indicated with sufficient clearness in other parts of the Word of God. While we believe that the mode is not essential to the validity of baptism, we hold, however, that

it is indicated with sufficient clearness to direct the meek and obedient. On the other hand, the Baptists maintain that immersion is the only Scriptural mode, and that it is essential. They deny that all who were not baptized in that particular manner are members of the visible church of Christ. This is surely a bold position to take, and requires clear and undeniable Scripture evidence to maintain it. We mean, then, to hear the statements of their witnesses, and to cross-examine them if necessary. But before we proceed let us notice that, if any passage of Scripture relied on, in proof of any doctrine or view, admits of a different interpretation without doing violence to its grammatical structure, or to the context, it fails to prove the matter in question, and should not any more be advanced as evidence in that particular point. If the name of a man is fraudulently written without his knowledge on the bottom of a draft payable at a certain bank, and there discounted; when payment is demanded, and refused, the case goes into court, and some witnesses swear that the signature is his, but on cross-examination they admit that the hand-writing of one or several persons in the neighbourhood is as much, or more like the signature in question as his is; in such a case any intelligent and upright jury would bring in a verdict in his favour.

We do well to bear this simple rule in mind, and apply it as we proceed.

Let us suppose, then, that the word "baptize" is called into court as the witness on whom the Baptists principally rely.

"IMMERSIONIST" to witness : What is your name?

"WITNESS." My name is "Baptize."

IM. What is your nationality?

W. I am a Greek, and called "Baptizo" in my native tongue.

IM. Did not your name originally mean "to immerse?"

W. Yes, it did; and it also meant to—

IM. Stop there. Do not speak more than you are asked.

IMMERSIONIST, addressing himself to the cou', says:—The witness has clearly stated that his name meant "to immerse" at one time. If so, it means the same now. The witness may go.

We interfere, however, through our counsel, "Candour," who commands the witness to stop.

CAN. You are a Greek, you say?

W. Yes.

CAN. Did your name in ancient times mean anything but to immerse?

W. Yes, it did. Both in its shorter form, *baptc*, and its

longer form, *baptizo*, it was used to signify a great many other things, such as "to dye," "to give one a bloody head," "to wet," "to sprinkle," "to drown."

CAN. Mr. Immersionist denies all that, or at least does not like to hear it.

W. He would know better if he had been acquainted with my ancestors; but I see that he wears coloured spectacles.

CAN. Does your name mean "to immerse" in the Greek New Testament?

W. I am not aware that it does in a single instance, but it unmistakeably and necessarily means "to sprinkle" in a good many places.

CAN. That will do, witness; you may go.

COURT to "Immersionist." Who is your next witness?

IM. John the Baptist.

John is called, and directly appears.

IM. Is your name John the Baptist?

JOHN. I am John, the son of Zacharias the Priest, and I am popularly called John the Baptist.

IM. Why do they call you John the Baptist?

JOHN. I suppose it is because I baptized the people.

IM. Did you not baptize in Jordan?

JOHN. Yes.

IM. And also at Enon, near Salem?

JOHN. Yes.

IM. Did you not baptize at these places because there was much water in them?

JOHN. Ye-yes. I do not quite—

IM. You say that you baptized at Enon because there was much water there. That proves immersion, without any possibility of successfully gainsaying it. You may go, John.

CAN. Wait a little, John. Did you say "much water?"

JOHN. He said "much water," and I could not well contradict him, seeing that he quoted from the English New Testament; but the truth is, I went to Enon because there were many waters there, several springs and streams, where the people who came to be baptized in very large multitudes could easily find water to drink, dress their food, and for other purposes. You must know that in the warm climate of Judea the people use much water.

CAN. But did you not immerse the people when you baptized them?

JOHN. Who says that? I am sure I never did.

CAN. Immersionist and his clients maintain that you baptized by immersion. Have you not given them some information on the subject?

JOHN. I never did.

CAN. How did you baptize, then?

JOHN. I baptized as Moses did when he sanctified the people, the Levites, and the priests.

CAN. You did not then immerse them?

JOHN. To do so was physically impossible; for I baptized several thousand in six months, and besides I preached a great deal during that period. I am sure that to baptize them as you say, would take me three years at least, standing in water to the middle for six hours every day, and that, no man could stand for three months.

CAN. But did not God sustain you by a miracle?

JOHN. He would certainly do that if there had been sufficient reason for it; but there was none that I can see in the case.

CAN. You say that you imitated Moses when he sanctified the people, the Levites, and the priests. Will you be good enough to tell us how that was done?

JOHN. He sanctified the people at Mount Sinai by sprinkling them with blood. "And he sent young men of the Children of Israel, which offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the **LORD**. And Moses took half of the blood, and put it in basins; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar. And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, all that the **LORD** hath said will we do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant which the **LORD** hath made with you concerning all these words." Ex. xxiv. 5-8. He sanctified the Levites by sprinkling them with the water of purification. "Take the Levites from among the Children of Israel, and cleanse them. And thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them: sprinkle water of purifying upon them."—Num. viii. 6, 7. The priests were consecrated in a similar manner: "And thou shalt take the garments, and put upon Aaron the coat, and the robe of the ephod, and the breast-plate, and gird him with the curious girdle of the ephod. And thou shalt put the mitre upon his head, and put the holy crown upon the mitre. Then shalt thou take the anointing-oil, and pour it upon his head, and anoint him."—Ex. xxix. 5-7.

CAN. But did you not immerse the Saviour in Jordan?

JOHN. No.

CAN. Is it not said in Matthew, third chapter and sixteenth verse, that, "When he was baptized," he "went up straight-way out of the water?"

JOHN. I see that in your English New Testament you have the words "out of," but the Greek word "*apo*" means also from, or away from. Indeed, a school-boy could tell you its meaning.

CAN. Pray, do not lose your temper, John.

JOHN. Such trifling with the Word of God is enough to make any honest man indignant.

CAN. Patience, John ! It is Immersionist who maintains that "He came up out of the water." We deny it.

JOHN. Immersionist and his clients are incurably blind and obstinate with reference to the matter. If they were not so, they would see that "*apo*" means "from." For instance, in the passages where the taunts of Christ's enemies are recorded when he was crucified : "If thou art the Son of God, come down (*apo*) from the cross." "If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down (*apo*) from the cross."—Matt. xxvii. 40, 42. "Save thyself, and come down (*apo*) from the cross."—Mark xv. 30. The phrase surely does not mean "out of the cross."

CAN. Thank you, John, for your satisfactory explanation. You may go.

Then the Court asked Immersionist if he had another witness ready.

IM. I have a witness who will prove my case beyond any cavil.

COURT. Call him, then.

Then Philip, accompanied by the Ethiopian Eunuch, came into court.

IM. Is your name Philip ?

PHIL. Yes, Philip the Evangelist.

IM. Did you not, on a certain occasion, go in haste from Samaria to that desert through which the road from Jerusalem to Gaza passes ?

PHIL. Yes, I did; for the Spirit directed me to do so.

IM. Whom did you meet there, and what took place between you ? Please tell us all you remember of what occurred.

PHIL. I met this nobleman going home from Jerusalem to Ethiopia. He was riding in a chariot, and reading a book. I asked him if he understood it, and he replied that he could not do so without some one to teach him. He invited me to ride with him. I did so ; and discovered that he was reading the fifty-second and fifty-third chapters of Isaiah. From that prophecy I preached Jesus to him, so much to his satisfaction that when we came to some water he expressed his desire to be baptized. He said : "See, here is water ; what doth hinder me to be baptized." I replied, "If thou be-

lievest with all thine heart, thou mayest." "And he answered, and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Upon this profession of faith I cheerfully administered the ordinance to him.

IM. You immersed him, did you not?

PHIL. No.

IM. Take care what you say, witness; for the record of the transaction very clearly says that you immersed him; these are the words: "And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him. And when they come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip."—Acts viii. 38, 39. You went down together into the water, and when you baptized him, you both came up out of the water; it is therefore clear that you immersed him.

PHIL. You may ask Luke, who wrote the narrative, what he means by the expressions "went down both into the water" and "were come up out of the water," but I certainly did not immerse the man, for two reasons: First, because there was not water enough, and, secondly, because such a mode of baptism would be contrary to the prophetic promise contained in the passage under consideration where the prophet foretold that Christ would baptize by sprinkling. "So shall he sprinkle many nations."—Isa. lii. 15. I would not for my life immerse him in opposition to the Word of God. I also knew many other similar predictions which clearly stated that Christian baptism, both real baptism by the Holy Ghost, and ritual baptism, should be administered by sprinkling or pouring, while there is not the slightest intimation, as far as I know, that either should be performed by immersion. This all the first preachers of Christianity understood, and the people, particularly the Jewish believers, knew it as well as we did. It is really amazing how men, who profess to be guided by the Word of God, presume to depart from the mode so clearly expressed in the promises, and which was foreshadowed in all the ceremonial purifications. Almost everything was purified by the sprinkling of water and sacrificial blood, and nothing by immersion in them. Persons who were defiled by the dead were cleansed by sprinkling them with the water that was mixed with the ashes of the red heifer.

IM. I shall prove you a false witness, both by the testimony of Luke, and also by the mode of purifying a house that was affected with the leprosy. You must admit yourself that a living bird was for that purpose dipped in the blood of a slain bird.—Lev. xiv. 51.

PHIL. Yes, I admit that and more: the priest officiating on such an occasion was commanded to "take the cedar-wood, and the hyssop, and the scarlet, and the living bird, and dip them in the blood of the slain bird, and in the running water, and sprinkle the house seven times;" but a man's mind must be amazingly confused who finds purification by immersion in that passage; for though the English Bible says that the cedar, hyssop, scarlet, and the living bird were dipped in the blood, yet it does not say that the house was dipped, and it is the latter, and not the former, that was purified. I may fetch water for baptism from a well or river by dipping a vessel in it, but no one would call that baptizing the vessel.

IM. You may go, sir; I will soon prove you to be a false witness. Call Luke the writer of the Acts of the Apostles.

Luke appears in court.

IM. What is your name?

LUKE. Luke.

IM. Are you the author of the Acts of the Apostles?

LUKE. I did write a short account of some of their labours.

IM. Was the account of the baptism of the Eunuch by Philip written by you?

LUKE. Yes.

IM. Do you not say in that account that "they went both down into the water" and came "up out of the water"?

LUKE. It is true that it is so rendered in the English New Testament, but that is not exactly what I wrote.

IM. Be good enough to tell us then what you did write?

LUKE. I wrote in Greek, and, for "into" and "out of" I wrote "*eis*," and "*ek*."

IM. Just so, and do not these prepositions mean "into" and "out of?"

LUKE. They do sometimes, but not always. We are not entitled to connect these ideas with them unless the context plainly shows that such is their meaning. No man would understand *eis* to mean "into" in the following passages: "And his fellow-servant fell down (*eis*) at his feet."—Mat. xviii. 29. Surely you will not say that a person could fall *into* another man's feet? "Go thou (*eis*) to the sea and cast an hook."—Mat. xxvii. 27. "And seeing the multitudes, he went up (*eis*) into the mountain." "*Eis*" is used in the Gospel according to John, where it is distinctly said that the person spoken of did not go into the place named, "Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came (*eis*) to the sepulchre. So they ran both together, and the other

disciple did outrun Peter, and came first (*eis*) to the sepulchre, and he stooping down, and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying ; yet went he not in."—John xx. 3-5.

In like manner *ek* does not always mean "out of," but often signifies "from" or "by," as in the passage "the tree is known (*ek*) by its fruit."—Mat. xii. 33. No man can say, out of its fruit, or if he did, no one could understand him.

"CANDOUR" then said that the case might as well be closed if Immersionist had no better evidence to bring forward in support of his plea. The latter replied that he had Matthew, Mark, John, Peter, and Paul to examine yet.

The three Evangelists were then called, and appeared together in court.

IM. Do you, gentlemen, not say that John the Baptist replied to a certain question asked him, "I indeed baptize you (*en*) with water." Mat. iii. 11; Mark i. 8; John i. 26 ?

CAN. Why did you not examine Luke on that point ?

IM. Luke is prejudiced as is evident to the court.

CAN. It is well-known to all intelligent readers of Luke's narrative in the original that he did not use the preposition "*en*," but the Dative case, which signifies that whereby the act was performed. He says in the parallel passage, "I baptize you with water," and his words will not admit of any other rendering.

IM. These three witnesses use "*en*." Do you not gentlemen ?

EVAN. We do use "*en*" in these passages ; but Luke does not, because his composition is better than ours.

IM. Does not "*en*," however, signify "in ?"

EVAN. Yes.

IM. Then we should render it "I indeed baptize you *in* water," and this would clearly show your meaning to be immersion. The court will now notice that this threefold evidence is plainly in our favour.

CAN. The court will permit us to cross-examine the witnesses. Does "*en*" signify nothing but "in ?"

EVAN. It has a variety of meanings, as you may see by a slight examination of any of us. Matthew writes—"swear not at all ; neither (*en*) by Heaven, for it is God's throne ; nor (*en*) by the earth, for it is His footstool ; neither by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear (*en*) by thy head."—Mat. v. 84-86. Paul, the most learned amongst us, uses the same preposition in the same way, where he says—"Shall I come unto you (*en*) with a rod."—1 Cor. iv. 21. To come "in" a rod would be a strange mode of

travelling. John can tell you what Christ said to him in Patmos. "He that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations ; and he shall rule them (*en*) with a rod of iron."—Rev. ii. 26, 27. "And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations (*en*) with a rod of iron."—Rev. xii. 5. "And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that (*en*) with it he should smite the nations ; and he shall rule them (*en*) with a rod of iron."—Rev. xix. 15.

The court, with slight indications of impatience, asked Immersionist if he wished to call his other witnesses, whereupon he called Peter.

IM. Did you not baptize Cornelius and his friends ?

PETER. I did so.

IM. You immersed them, of course ?

PETER. How could I immerse them when the Holy Ghost, of whom the water in baptism is an emblem, descended upon them. "He fell on all who heard the word," and so I baptized them by pouring water upon them. No reasonable man could do it otherwise in the circumstances.

IM. But did not you and your brother Apostles immerse on the day of Pentecost ?

PETER. I wonder how any man can think so; you surely forget that we baptized three thousand on that day, to baptize whom by immersion was impossible, because we had not water enough at our command in Jerusalem for the purpose. No man would give us leave to pollute his own cistern by plunging so many persons into it, because water was scarce in the city, and the public cisterns and pools were under the control of the priests and municipal authorities, who were so hostile to our cause that they would not permit us to immerse so great a multitude in them ; and even if we got leave we could not dip so many under water in a small part of one day, for we spent several hours in preaching.

CAN. May I ask you how you did baptize them. Was it one at a time ?

PETER. That was not at all necessary, you must have read that when Moses sanctified the people at Mount Sinai, he sprinkled the congregation at once ; for, taking "the blood of bulls and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop," he "sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying : This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you."—Heb. ix. 19, 20. Following the example of Moses we could baptize the three thousand in a few minutes, and the five thousand a few days thereafter in half-an-hour or so.

"Immersionist," evidently disappointed, asked the court to call Paul, who immediately appears.

IM. Have you not said that the children of Israel "were baptized (*eis*) unto Moses (*en*) in the cloud and (*en*) in the sea?"—1 Cor. x. 2.

PAUL. Yes.

"**IMMERSIONIST**" addresses the court, and says: We have at last got a case of baptism by immersion, for on that occasion they were certainly in the cloud and in the sea, for the cloud was over them and the sea on both sides of them.

CAN. Do you mean, Paul, that "*eis*" and "*en*" used in that passage mean "into" and "in?"

PAUL. Not by any means; because then I would say that they were baptized into Moses as a baptizing element, and I would also state what was not true, for they were not in the water of the sea at all. The wind blew the spray upon them, and that was sprinkling rather than immersion. Asaph gives a clear account of it, "Thou hast" says he "with thine arm redeemed thy people, the sons of Jacob and Joseph. The waters saw thee, O God, the waters saw thee; they were afraid: the depths also were troubled. The clouds poured out water, the skies sent out a sound, thine arrows also went abroad. The voice of thy thunder was in the heaven, the lightening lightened the world, the earth trembled and shook. . . . Thou leddest thy people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron."—Ps. lxxvii. 15-20. David refers to the same, and says: "He rebuked the Red Sea also, and it dried up; so he led them through the depths, as through the wilderness."—Ps. cxi. 9. They must have, therefore, passed over the bed of the sea on dry ground. There was surely no immersion in the case. The Egyptians were immersed, but not baptized.

IM. After all, Paul, do you not say that believers are buried with Christ in baptism?

PAUL. Yes.

IM. The court will please to notice this evidence. It unquestionably proves baptism by immersion; for if believers are buried with Christ in baptism, they must be put under the water as he was put into the earth when buried. You may go, Paul.

CAN. Stay a little, Paul. Do you mean water baptism in that passage?

PAUL. This is what I say: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by

the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For, if we have been planted in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." Rom vi. 3-5. "And ye are complete in Him, which is the head of all principality and power. In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ. Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."—Col. ii. 10-12. The baptism, wherein we are buried with Christ, of which I speak, is "baptism into Christ," and this I also call "baptism into his death," and "baptism into death." In this baptism we are not figuratively, but really, crucified, buried, and raised with Christ. I also call it, "being planted together," and this is done, not symbolically, but actually; for as living trees we are planted with Christ in order to grow and bear fruit. Surely water-baptism has nothing to do with that operation. In the Epistle to the Colossians I call it "the circumcision of Christ," and the "circumcision made without hands." You will observe that, as water-baptism is made by human hands, it cannot be the baptism whereof I speak. You see, then, that I refer to the baptism of the spirit, or regeneration, whereby we are enabled to rest on Christ by faith, and become united to Him in all that He did for us as our representative. Then we realize the fact that, when he was crucified, buried, and raised from the dead, we were crucified, buried, and raised with Him. You may notice that, when I speak of water-baptism, I do not call it "baptism into Christ," "or baptism into Christ's death," but "baptism into the name of Christ," or some such phrase. Even if I did mean ritual baptism in the two places referred to, I cannot see why it should be regarded as a proof of immersion; for, if baptism were an emblem of Christ's burial, the water should come in contact with the person baptized only on one side; because Christ was buried in a sepulchre hewn out in a rock, and He was not lowered into it, but carried in, or perhaps raised. His body lay on the floor of the cave, and the rock touched it only underneath. I wonder if any one would call such contact with water, immersion. The burial which it resembles is that done at sea, when the corpse is thrown overboard, with weights attached to cause it to sink to the bottom; it is not like any other burial, ancient or modern. People generally bury their dead now, not by forcing the corpse into the earth, as they would a person in water if they baptized by immer-

sion, but they first remove the earth, let the body down into the vacant space, and after that pour the earth upon it. Baptism by immersion is not by any means an emblem of that mode of burial, nor of any other burial, either of Christ or our own, but of our regeneration, as circumcision was while in use.

When Paul was dismissed, the Court asked "Immersionist" if he had any more witnesses to call. He replied that, though he could certainly prove his case by the testimonies of the fathers of the early centuries, yet it was useless to contend with the quibbling and cavilling of the other side.

To this "Candour" said: If we were simple enough to believe all that the old gentlemen referred to had said on that and other subjects, he might prove anything he pleased by them; but for our part, we do not regard them as reliable witnesses. If "Immersionist," however, chooses to call them, we have no objection, for the Court will see that they will soon contradict each other, and even themselves; but if "Immersionist" considers them trustworthy, he should believe all they say; and so anoint those baptized with chrism, and clothe them in white, or baptize them in a nude state, dip them three times, or dip their heads only. This is the kind of evidence we would get if we examined the Fathers. In conclusion, I hold that Immersionist's witnesses, instead of proving his views to be in accordance with Scripture, very clearly proved ours to be so, and his to have no warrant therefrom. It is evident that John the Baptist and Philip baptized by sprinkling. The circumstances render it altogether probable that Peter and the other Apostles did so on the Day of Pentecost; that Peter so baptized Cornelius and his friends; that Paul and Silas so baptized the jailor and his household, and as for Paul's baptism, it could not be immersion, for he was standing at the time. Luke, in his account of it, says, he "arose, and was baptized." Acts ix. 18. If rendered literally from the original it is, "and standing, he was baptized." I need not remind the Court that all we just now contend for, is, that baptism by dipping receives not the slightest countenance from the Word of God, either directly or indirectly. I leave the case in the hands of the Court, and confidently wait for a decision in our favour.

The Court, in giving its sentence, said: The learned counsel, "Immersionist," completely failed to prove his case, for his own witnesses proved the opposite view, and showed that baptism by sprinkling and pouring, but not immersion, agrees with Old Testament illustrations and prophetic promises. The Court entirely agrees with the learned counsel of the

into it.
m of
christ
was

nist"
that,
onies
ss to
le.
lieve
and
hem;
sses.
ve no
con-
nist"
say;
them
three
eience
on, I
g, his
roved
It is
rink-
that
cost;
Paul
as for
sand-
rose,
from
need
that
ance
eave
t for

rned
case,
owed
sion,
ises.
' the

defence. It cannot be reasonably supposed that the Apostles, on the Day of Pentecost, and Peter, in the house of Cornelius, baptized in any other way than after the manner of the Spirit's baptism. In both cases he came down upon them, and after the same mode water was poured or sprinkled on the candidates. That Paul was baptized standing is undeniable; and the circumstances of the case render it probable that the jailor at Philippi and his household were baptized by sprinkling. The Court is constrained to say that immersion has no Scripture authority, and should not, therefore, be practised; and that if the defence should choose to adopt their argument, and to act in their spirit, they would deny that all baptized by immersion only are baptized at all, and consequently neither members of the visible church of Christ, nor entitled to partake of the Lord's Supper, or any other of its privileges.

When this case was decided, the Court asked "Immersionist," if he was prepared to go on with his other case.

Then "Immersionist," with some hesitation, rose and said : Though I lost my former plea through the ingenuity of the opposite counsel, and unfair cross-examination of my witnesses, yet I feel secure with regard to our views on "the subjects" of Baptism ; for the Scriptures clearly command the baptism of believers.

"CANDOUR" replied : So far we agree with you. But before we proceed, the Court will permit me to say that I distinctly repudiate the unfairness, in cross-examining his witnesses, charged upon us by the learned counsel. If such was the case, why did he not object at the time, when the matter was before us.

IM. I let that pass in the meantime. I stand here to charge your clients with the sin of baptizing infants without Scripture authority, and that I hold to be more important than the mode of baptism. The order is, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved." That plainly shews that none but believers should be baptized. Infants cannot believe, and therefore they should not be baptized.

CAN. Your argument proves too much, and therefore fails to prove your point; read the next clause of the passage, and see where your own reasoning leads you: "He that believeth not shall be damned." Infants cannot believe, and, according to you, infants shall be damned.

IM. I do not hold that execrable doctrine.

CAN. We do not charge yourself with it, since you disavow it; but we still charge your argument with it.

IM. You have no authority for infant baptism in the Word

of God. You cannot produce a "thus saith the Lord" in support of the practice.

CAN. Your logic is vicious again. Your argument proves too much, and you mistake the state of the question. First. Your argument proves too much, because it excludes females from the Lord's table, and deprives you of Scriptural authority for keeping the Sabbath on the first day of the week; there is no express command, a "thus saith the Lord," for either. Secondly. You mistake the state of the question; for, seeing that the infants of the people of God had been members of the Church from the beginning, for it had been expressly commanded that they should be solemnly dedicated to God since the days of Abraham, by putting the seal of the covenant upon them. The proper state of the question is, What is the authority for excluding them now—a "thus saith the Lord?" The burden of proof rests upon you, and not upon us. In the covenant promise, God engaged himself to Abraham to bestow its blessings and privileges, not only on himself, but also on his seed after him. "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee."—Gen. xvii. 7. There you have the charter, the seal of which was circumcision at first, and it was ordered to be administered to infants on the eighth day after their birth. We ask, then, have the infants of God's people been since excluded? If so, when? Where is the statute of exclusion? Produce it if there is such. We are in possession, and we plead the statutes of the kingdom in proof of our title to the property. We would be guilty of disloyalty and ingratitude to our Benefactor if we yielded it up to please the notions of people who have despised it to suit their own fancy.

IM. The Abrahamic covenant was not a spiritual and church covenant, but a national covenant only, and its privileges and promises were merely temporal.

CAN. The descendants of Abraham, by Isaac and Jacob, did not become a nation for over four hundred years after the covenant was made. Then, and not till then, God gave them a national constitution and laws; but these did not affect the old covenant, for it is everlasting.—Gal iii. 17. The Church is one from the beginning; its promises and privileges are the same in all ages, only that they are more clearly set forth, and more liberally bestowed under the New Testament dispensation; but none are withdrawn. Every true son of Abraham has to-day a covenant-right to every blessing promised and granted to him; if he was obliged to put the

covenant seals on his infant sons, so is every believer bound to do now. To deny this, without proof, is impertinent presumption.

IM. There was no church until the coming of Christ, so that membership in it is a different thing from membership in the old Israelitish commonwealth.

CAN. Stephen calls it "the church in the wilderness."—Acts vii. 38. The Saviour calls it the sheep-fold into which he said he would bring his other sheep which were not then of it.—John x. 14. Paul calls it the olive tree from which some of the native branches were cut off, and into which branches from a wild olive were grafted. It is the same living organism from first to last.

IM. Circumcision was not the seal of a spiritual, but of a national covenant, and therefore baptism does not occupy its place.

CAN. Did I not show that, when the covenant was made with Abraham, he was no nation, but a family only, and his descendants were in a family condition for over four hundred years. The Apostle Paul calls circumcision the seal, not of a temporal covenant and its promises, but of the righteousness of faith.—Rom. iv. 11.

IM. Baptism does not occupy the place of circumcision, because it is administered to females as well as males, whereas circumcision was administered to the latter only.

CAN. The privileges of the covenant are enlarged under the New Testament dispensation, and distinctions are abolished. In the church there is now neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female, but all occupy the same standing. The Old Testament dispensation was more representative, the priests represented the people in the public worship of God, and the males represented the females. "Immersionist" and his clients forget this change, or rather they fail to observe it, notwithstanding their professed respect for the Word of God.

IM. I deny that infants are members of the Christian Church, and challenge the whole world to prove that they are.

CAN. My learned friend may challenge the whole world to make him confess it, or perhaps to convince him of it, but he *should* admit it, seeing that neither he, nor any one else, can show that they are not. Though this is the proper way of dealing with the question at present, yet I will show that we have two statements in the Scriptures which clearly express the membership of infants. When some pious mothers brought their little ones to the Saviour that He might bless

them, the disciples who then laboured under the same prejudice as our friends, forbade them, but Christ said "suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me ; for of such is the kingdom of heaven."—Mat. xix. 14. If my opponent admits that "the kingdom of heaven" is the Church of Christ, he must admit that it consists in part at least of children.

IM. The passage only says that it consists of persons like children.

CAN. In that case Christ spoke something bordering upon nonsense. He himself calls believers his sheep, because these creatures resemble them in certain respects ; but can we possibly suppose that of sheep he would say "for of such is the kingdom of heaven." At a certain season of the year a farmer sends his lambs and some sheep into a certain field. Some days thereafter one of his servants brings a few more lambs to the same field, but he is met at the gate by a fellow-servant who considers himself very wise, and he orders the man to take the lambs away on the plea that the master lately commanded all the old sheep to be let in there, without giving any instruction concerning lambs. You must take these away, says he ; for we received new orders, and they say nothing about lambs ; you have therefore no authority for sending them in. I act, says the one in charge of the lambs, upon the master's former order, because I do not understand the last to interfere with it at all. Upon this the master appears, and the gate-keeper complains of his fellow-servant, and accuses him of sending lambs into the field without orders. The master replies, suffer him to put the lambs into the field, for it was inclosed for such. Could anyone understand him to mean sheep that were in some respects like lambs ?

The next passage is that where the apostle Paul says that certain children are holy, 1 Cor. vii. 14, not in the sense of moral purity but of consecration. The passage plainly teaches that the children of a believing parent, in virtue of the relationship, differ from the children of unbelievers, though my learned opponent would treat them alike. From these passages we see that some children are members of the church, and that they are so, either baptized or unbaptised. If unbaptised, baptism is not necessary to membership in the church, if necessary, such children are, or should be baptized. Baptism is necessary to membership, or it is not ; Immissionist must accept either alternative. If he takes the first, as I think he must, he is driven to admit the Scripture authority for infant baptism.

In the New Testament we learn that the Apostles baptized four households. Those of Cornelius, Lydia, the jailor, and Stephanus, and the probability, that at least one infant was among them is so high that no one is justified in denying it. In any place take four contiguous families, and in nine cases out of ten you will find one or more infants. I presume that I might raise the probability much higher, but I prefer to make a moderate supposition. I now, without further argument, leave the case to the decision of the Court.

The Court, then in giving its decision, said: though the views of Immersionist and his clients appear plausible to many, yet when fairly tested, they are proved to be altogether un-Scriptural. If they deny the right and duty of Christian parents to have their children baptized, they should, in consistency, deny the right of females to partake of the Lord's Supper, and the propriety of keeping holy the first day of the week. Indeed, some of them are so desperately consistent as to deny the obligation of the latter, and that the church has no right to urge its observance on any one. These are the views of the Plymouth Brethren, and all the Baptist Churches will probably end in this, or similar anti-Christian errors, or else renounce their peculiar views.

APPENDIX.

Since I delivered the substance of the above examination of the views of the Baptists, as a lecture, I was told that they often object to all references to the original Scriptures with regard to the points in dispute, but maintain that the English Bible is quite sufficient to decide the controversy in their favour. I mention this to show their inconsistency; for they, more than others, appeal to the original meaning, as they say, of the word "baptize,"; and, not content with the good authorized version, they made a version of their own, where for "baptize," they have "immerse"; for "baptism," "immersion"; and for "John the Baptist," "John the Immerser," or "Immersionist."

There was also a Baptist pamphlet put into my hands, entitled "The Scripture Guide to Baptism," by Mr. Pengilly, and published in Philadelphia by the American Baptist Publication Society.

This writer, with an appearance of great respect and confidence in the Scriptures, requests the reader to turn his eye "from the diversified, and often varying practices of men, to that unerring and unchangeable source of information," the Word of God. He then asks the question : "What does the *word* in the original language, employed by the Spirit of God to express the ordinance, signify ? In answer, he says : "To obtain therefore, the *sense* of this word, we will turn to a Lexicon." Besides this Lexicon, he appeals to statements by Adam Clarke, Doddridge, Scott, Campbell, Dr. Chalmers, Calvin, and many others. This writer appeals from human opinions and practices to the Word of God, and secretly finding the Word of God to be not in his favour, he quietly leaves it and rests his case on a Lexicon and a number of eminent men. This is invariably the practice of Baptists. They profess to regard the Scriptures as the supreme judge in the controversy, but they prefer human opinions after all, for there they leave the case at last. If the Bible is in their favour, why not rest there ? If these quotations from eminent writers were always reliable, it would be some satisfaction to the reader, but it must be said that this is not always the case. To show that I do not say this without reason I give some extracts from a letter from the late Rev.

Dr. Samuel Miller, of Princeton, to the Rev. James Wharey, author of "Sketches of Church History," and appended thereto. Dr. Miller says: "You request me to give some solution of the question? Why, in the 'History of the Waldenses,' by Mr. William Jones, of the Baptist denomination, which has been extensively circulated in the United States, nothing appears to indicate the paedo-Baptist belief and practice of these far-famed witnesses of the truth? In reply to this inquiry, I have only to say, that two facts are unquestionable. The one fact is, that the ancient records of the Waldenses do contain abundant and conclusive evidence that they did baptise their children. The other fact is, that Mr. Jones has carefully withheld all the evidences of this fact from his readers. . . . In an old 'defence,' which the Waldenses of Bohemia sent to Ladislaus, their King, . . . they repel a number of calumnies, which had been circulated against them by the Romanists. . . . The fourth calumny was concerning baptism, which it was said they denied to little infants, but from this imputation they acquit themselves as follows: Neither is the time or place appointed for those who must be baptized. . . . "True it is," say they, "that being for some hundreds of years constrained to suffer our children to be baptized by the Roman priests, we deferred the doing of it as long as possible, because we detested the human inventions annexed to the institution of that Holy Sacrament. . . . And by reason that our pastors, . . . are often in travels abroad for the service of the church."—Perrin, Part II. Book 1. chap. iv.

In a "Treatise of the Old Waldenses and Albigenses concerning Antichrist, Purgatory, Invocation of the Saints, and the Sacraments," and dated by Perrin in 1220, the following passage, under the head of Sacraments, occur: "That which is of no necessity in the administration of baptism, is the exorcism, the breathing on, the sign of the cross upon the infant's head and forehead, the salt which they put into his mouth, the spittle put into his ears and nose, &c."—Perrin, Part II. book V., Art. iv.

In a "Brief Confession of Faith," made with general consent by the ministers and heads of families of the churches in the valleys of Piedmont, assembled at Augrogne, September 12, 1582, the following explicit declaration is found:—

"Concerning the matter of the sacraments, it has been determined by the Holy Scriptures, that we have but two sacramental signs left us by Jesus Christ: the one is Baptism, the other is the Eucharist, which to show that our per-

severance in the faith is such as we promised when we were baptised, being little children." . . . *Morland*, Book I. chap. iv.

Again, Perrin tells us that, in the year 1506, Louis XII., King of France, . . . sent a trusty agent . . . to enquire into their real character and habits. The agent . . . reported . . . "that they caused their children to be baptized."—*Perrin*, Part II. Book II. chapter viii.

As to the second fact which I mentioned, it is certain that not a syllable of the foregoing extracts, or anything like them, is to be found in Mr. Jones's history. He refers familiarly to the works of Perrin and Sir Samuel Morland, and speaks of them as the principal sources from which he had drawn his materials, but carefully excludes everything, which they say, that savours of infant baptism. Nay, more, he expressly quotes the "Treatise on Antichrist, &c.," and the "Defence," sent to King Ladislaus, and seems to regard them as perfectly authentic documents, worthy of entire credit, and proceeds to pick out from them what suited his purpose as a Baptist; but the facts, so clearly and unequivocally stated, which make against the Baptist cause, he studiously withholds from his readers.

But this is not the worst. The last extract above stated, from Perrin, found in Book I. chap v. of his history, Mr. Jones directly tampers with, and falsifies. . . . In the case . . . he is guilty of direct forgery! The statement, in Perrin, stands thus:—

"King Louis XII., having received information from the enemies of the Waldenses, dwelling in Provence, of several heinous crimes which they fastened upon them, sent to the place Monsieur Adam Fumee, Master of Requests, and a certain Sorbonnist doctor, called Parui, who was his confessor, to inquire into the matter. They visited all their parishes and temples, and neither found there any images, or signs of the ornaments belonging to the mass, or ceremonies of the Romish Church. Much less could they discover any of those crimes with which they were charged. But rather, that they kept the Sabbath duly; caused their children to be baptized, according to the Primitive Church; taught them the articles of the Christian faith, and the Commandments of God. . . . Book I. chap. v.

Now, this passage Mr. Jones professes to quote, and expressly refers to Perrin as the source from which he derived it. But, instead of honestly copying the statement above quoted—"they caused their children to be baptized, according

to the Primitive Church ;" he alters and makes it read thus : "They kept the Sabbath Day ; observed the ordinance of baptism, according to the Primitive Church ; instructed their children in the articles of the Christian faith, &c."—Jones ii. chap. v. sec. iv. p. 71. Here is neither more nor less than the very essence of forgery ! It is solemnly, in the face of the public, representing an author as saying what he does not say ; and that, most evidently, to serve a sectarian turn."

tain that
thing like
He refers
Morland,
which he
erything,
ay, more,
," and the
ard them
re credit,
s purpose
quivocally
studiously

ve stated,
story, Mr.
. In the
The state-

from the
of several
ent to the
sts, and a
as his con-
l all their
ny images,
s, or cere-
l they dis-
e charged.
nsed their
e Church ;
d the Com-

ce, and ex-
he derived
ment above
d, according

The Following Books will be sent Post Free
to any Address on Receipt of Price.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST. By Rev. J. M. Porteous ; preface by Rev. Horatius Bonar.....	\$2 25
A DISCOURSE ON INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN PUBLIC WORSHIP. By Rev. Robert Johnson, A.M.....	0 25
CHRISTIAN WORSHIP—Praise Pure and Perfect, without Instrumental Music. By Rev. J. G. Robb, Toronto.....	0 10
THE ELDER AND HIS WORK. By David Dickson.....	0 15
SCIENCE AND REVELATION—A series of Lectures in reply to Theories of Tyndall, Huxley, Darwin, Spencer, &c.....	1 50
REGENERATION By late Rev. W. Anderson, Glasgow.	1 00
THE REIGN OF LAW. By the Duke of Argyle.....	0 75
CANADA PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH PULPIT. 2nd Series.	1 00
CAUTIONS FOR DOUBTERS. By Rev. J. H. Titcomb.	0 60
DICTIONARY OF THE HOLY BIBLE. By Dr. John Eadie.....	0 75
THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES—Its Meaning and its Lessons. By Rev. Robt. Buchanan. D.D.	1 50
NOTES OF A CLERICAL FURLough, SPENT CHIEFLy IN THE HOLY LAND. By Rev. Dr. Buchanan.....	1 50
THE MARTYR GRAVES OF SCOTLAND, with Illustrations. By John H. Thomson, D.D.....	1 00
THE LAND AND THE BOOK. By Rev. W. M. Thomson.	2 25
GRACE AND TRUTH UNDER TWELVE ASPECTS. By Rev. W. P. McKay, Paper, 30c.; cloth	0 60

Free

	THE CONFESION OF FAITH, containing the Larger and Smaller Catechisms, the Sum of Saving Knowledge, National and Sabbath Laysers, and Covenant, &c., &c.....	50 00
\$2 25	A CONCISE SYSTEM OF THEOLOGY on the basis of the Shorter Catechism. By A. M. Paterson, A. M. 0 45	
0 25	SCRIPTURAL BAPTISM—Its Mode and Subjects. By the same Author.....	0 15
0 10	The above Two Works in one vol., cloth.....	0 45
0 15	THE NEW TESTAMENT ENDER. By Prof. Witherspoon... 0 15	
1 50	DARWINISM, and its relation to the Truths of Natural and Revealed Religion. By Charles Hodge, D.D., Princeton.....	1 00
1 00	God's WORD THROUGH PREACHING. By Dr. John Hall	1 00
0 75	COMMENTARY ON THE CONFESION OF FAITH. By Rev. A. A. Hodge, D.D.....	1 00
0 60	BOOK OF PRAYERS FOR FAMILY WOMEN. By Rev. Prof. Gregg, M.A.....	1 00
0 75	THE SCRIPTURAL FORM OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT. By Rev. C. U. Stewart.....	1 00
1 50	MEMOIR OF THE REV. JOHN BAINES, Galt.....	0 50
1 50	MEMOIR AND SERMONS OF REV. M. E. STARK.....	1 00
1 00		
2 25		
0 60		

JAMES BAIN & SON,
BOOKSELLERS AND STATIONERS,

111 MADISON.

THE
RULES AND FORMS

Of Proceedure in the Church Courts of the late Canada
Presbyterian Church, authorized by the General
Assembly of the

Presbyterian Church in Canada,

To be used in all Church Courts in the meantime.

Price in Paper Cover, .35 cts. In Cloth Boards, .50 cts.

MARRIAGE CERTIFICATES,

IN BOOK FORM, .50 and .75c. PER BOOK.

COMMUNION ROLLS,

BAPTISMAL REGISTERS,

SESSION RECORDS,

PRESBYTERY RECORDS,

SERMON PAPER,

PENS, INK,

AND

Every Requisite for the Office or Study.

JAMES BAIN & SON.

Publishers, Booksellers & Stationers,

40 KING STREET EAST, TORONTO.

MS

Canada
al.

ada,

e.

50 cts.

TES,

ORDS,

, INK,

tudy.

ners,